DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 140 SP 012 934

AUTHOR Farquhar, Robin H.
TITLE The Professionalization of Teaching?
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Sociology; *Group Status; Professional Education; *Professional Recognition; *Social Status; Social Values; Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications; *Teachers; *Teaching

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the extent to which teaching may be classified as a profession. The major characteristics of a profession are summarized. The occupation of teaching is then examined with reference to the various factors identified as characteristic of a profession in the "classical" sense. It is concluded that, while teaching possesses several of the characteristics of a profession, it falls short on a number of them, particularly those involving autonomy and self-control on the part of the practitioners, depth of commitment and career-orientation, and the accordance of trust, status, and authority by the general public. Ways in which the occupation of teaching may move toward a higher level of professionalization are explored. It is concluded that while teaching is not a profession in the full traditional sense, teaching should be recognized as a distinct form of work, with its own occupational identity and integrity, and efforts should be made to improve it for its own sake. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159140

THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF TEACHING?

by

Robin H. Farquhar
Dean, College of Education
University of Saskatchewan

Summary: This paper analyzes the extent to which teaching may be classified as a profession. The major characteristics of a profession are summarized with reference to the job itself, the individual in the job, and the colleague group involved. The occupation of teaching is then examined with reference to the various factors identified as characteristic of a profession in the "classical" sense. As a result, it is concluded that, while teaching possesses several of the characteristics of a profession, it falls short on a number of them -- particularly those involving autonomy and self-control on the part of the practitioners, depth of commitment and career-orientation, and the accordance of trust, status, and authority by the general public. Ways in which the occupation of teaching may move toward a higher level of professionalization are then explored. Steps that can be taken by the individual practitioner and by the Teachers' Federation are considered in this regard. Finally, attention is given to emerging changes in the teacher education programs at the University of Saskatchewan's College of Education, and to the implications of these developments for the further professionalization of teaching. The paper concludes with the observation that teaching is not, and probably never will be, a profession in the full traditional sense. It is suggested that teachers should not aspire to imitate that kind of professionalism; rather, teaching should be recognized and nurtured as a distinct form of work, with its own occupational identity and integrity, and efforts should be made to enjoy and improve it for its own sake -- not in a futile attempt to "ape the professions."

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robin H. Farquhar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP012 934

This article is a response to a request that I both examine the subject of professionalism in teaching and report some of the changes emerging in our teacher education programs at the University of Saskatchewan. I shall try to incorporate these two topics into a coherent presentation by considering, first, what a professional is and the extent to which teachers may be considered to be professionals; I shall then examine some of the ways in which emerging developments in our College of Education can contribute to the growing professionalization of teaching.

What is a Professional?

At the special convocation in recognition of our College's fiftieth anniversary in October, 1977, Robert Howsam, a former Saskatonian who is now Dean of Education at the University of Houston, referred in his address to a major U.S. Bicentennial Commission sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, which he chaired. That Commission, which was established to study problems concerning the state and status of teacher education and the teaching profession, included in its final report a series of twenty-four assertions. The first one mentioned by Dr. Howsam in his address was: "Teaching is a profession."[1] But he went on to qualify that assertion, and I would like to explore herein some of the ways in which it should be qualified.

Let us consider, first, the question: What is a professional? The kind of general, popular definition that one might find in a good dictionary would probably suggest that a professional is:

(1) one who does socially important and difficult work;

(2) one who is committed to one's work more for reasons

distinct from services provided through other occupations.

2. The service being rendered is often perceived by the public to be vital; it is not only important to the survival of society, but it is also concerned with the life and death of individuals in society.
3. It involves an emphasis upon intellectual techniques in performing the service; it cannot be performed through physical labour alone because it requires the application of such cognitive skills as thinking, inquiry, problem solving, and decision making.
4. It is accorded a high level of social acceptance and prestige; those practising a profession are granted automatic superior status by virtue of their occupation alone, regardless of their own success in performing the work involved.
5. It is characterized by a broad range of autonomy; those practising it have a great deal of freedom in specifying their own work, in controlling their working conditions, in determining their clients, etc. Typically, it entails fee-for-service work rather than salaried duties; thus, the professional normally has many individual clients rather than a large coherent group of clients (such as a class) or one big client (such as an organization), and the professional can thereby remain independent of any single client. As a corollary to this, when a professional joins an organization (for example, a resident doctor or a corporation lawyer) he forfeits much of this aspect of his professionalism.

These, then, are the main characteristics of those occupations which sociologists designate as professions.

The Individual

What about the individuals who occupy professional roles, the professionals themselves? Their identifying characteristics are generally agreed to include the following:

1. They possess a high level of acknowledged and shared expertise; they have their own body of knowledge and skill and language, on which there is general consensus. This knowledge or skill is monopolized by those in the profession, in that they possess it to a much higher extent than anyone else; and their language is seldom well understood by those not in the profession -- others typically refer to it as academic jargon or scientific "gobbledegook." The knowledge, skill, and language of the professional are normally perceived by the public to be esoteric, mystical, or arcane -- because they simply do not understand it.
2. The professional has achieved a high level of formal education, gained over a long period of specialized training; this training usually involves selective entry at the point of admission, and shared ordeals in progressing through the program.
3. The professional views his occupation as his life work; he has struggled hard to get into it, he is prepared to defer gratification by over-exerting himself during the early stages in order to achieve major benefits later in his career, he is totally committed to his work and does not engage in other activities that compete with or supplement it, he frequently pursues in-service education opportunities in order to develop himself professionally and remain up-to-date with advances in his field, and he is so committed to the advancement of his profession that he strives to make his own contribution to knowledge through applied research on the job and sharing the results of his work by analyzing it and reporting it to his colleagues through publications,

having to do with values and psychic or intrinsic rewards than for money, fame, or extrinsic rewards;

(3) one whose work is governed not by the clock but by the demands of the job itself; and

(4) one who is good at one's work, and does not simply "play at" it.

If those statements constitute one's definition of a professional, then there can be no meaningful objection to the proclamation that "teachers are professionals." However, I would suggest that, by that definition, a great many people working today would qualify as professionals. Most of us have something a little more selective in mind when classifying teaching, so we should look a bit further before settling on our definition of a professional.

The study of work, and particularly of the characteristics of occupations, falls largely within the domain of sociologists. Thus, we must look to the literature of sociology for a full and formal definition of a professional, or (more accurately, since a professional is generally agreed to be one who practises a profession) of a profession. What is a profession, as distinct from other occupations? Sociologists generally agree on a number of characteristics that define a profession, and these may be categorized into three groups: those that refer to the job itself, those that refer to the individual in the job, and those that refer to the colleague group to which the individual belongs.[2]

The Job

With respect to the job itself, a profession is viewed to have the following characteristics:

1. It provides a unique, definite, and essential social service; the service is necessary to the maintenance and advancement of our culture and society, it is an identifiable service, and it can be recognized as

conference presentations, and other means.

4. He accepts broad personal responsibility for the judgements he makes and the acts he performs within the scope of professional autonomy; he is not directly supervised, and his primary accountability is to his clients rather than to an administrative superior.
5. His motivation is characterized by a service orientation, an altruism, an emphasis on the service to be rendered rather than on the income or status to be gained; the doctor's subscription to the Hippocratic Oath is illustrative of this orientation. It is recognized, nevertheless, that this kind of motivation represents an idea espoused by the professional group as a whole, but that certain individuals within the group may not live up to it completely.

So these are among the attributes that sociologists ascribe to the practitioners of a "true" profession.

The Colleague Group

There are also some characteristics of the colleague group to which a professional belongs that are generally held to be definitive. Among them are the following:

1. As indicated above, the group as a whole espouses a service orientation; this orientation is widely advertised and loudly upheld, largely in order to protect the profession itself from being sullied by charges of lesser motivations for such "base" rewards as income and prestige. Ironically, but I suspect intentionally, the more successful the colleague group is in convincing the public of its service orientation, the more successful it is in winning for its members the high income and status that are usually associated with professions.

2. The colleague group has developed a recognized code of ethics, which has been clarified and interpreted at ambiguous and doubtful points by concrete cases; this code of ethics is maintained by sanctions imposed by the colleague group on its members, rather than by external agencies. The result is considerable homogeneity of attitudes and practice among the members, as well as an esprit de corps and a sense of identity with the colleague group.
3. The colleague group takes the form of a comprehensive, self-governing organization of practitioners; it is usually referred to as a college or society, and sometimes as an association or a federation -- but almost never as a union, although it has many of the organizational characteristics of a union.
4. Through the structure of this organization, the colleague group maintains control over the training of its members and their entry into the profession; thus, the university is placed in the position of delivering training programs, determining enrolment numbers, applying admissions criteria, and implementing standards of progression through the program and graduation from it in response to the directives of the colleague group. If the university is not deemed by the colleague group to be sufficiently responsive to these directives, its graduates simply will not be licensed to practise the profession concerned.
5. Similarly, the colleague group monitors the performance and, to a considerable degree, controls the behaviour of individual practitioners. To the extent that a professional is supervised, it is more by the organization of his colleague group than by an administrative superior or a governmental agency; to the degree that administrators or politicians are accountable to the public for the performance of the members of a

profession, they delegate most of this accountability to the professionals' colleague group rather than exercising it themselves. These, then, are the characteristics that "round out" the definition of a profession as it has been developed by sociologists engaged in the study of occupations.

Are Teachers Professionals?

With this background, let's turn now to a consideration of the extent to which teachers may be considered to be professionals, or teaching a profession. As indicated previously, I don't think there can be much argument with the assertion that "teachers are professionals" if one accepts the generally popular, dictionary-type definition of that term. Certainly, a teacher is one who does socially important and difficult work, who is committed to it for reasons having to do more with values and psychic or intrinsic rewards than with money or fame or extrinsic rewards, and whose work is governed not by the clock but by the demands of the job itself. But this conclusion must be modified if one aspires to professionalism in accordance with the more comprehensive and rigorous definition developed by sociologists. There is no doubt that practitioners of law and medicine qualify as professionals by the definition, and engineers, architects, clerics, academics, accountants, and a few others may also satisfy a sufficient number of the criteria to be counted "in." The inclusion of teachers, however, is more debatable. So let's examine teaching with reference to the characteristics of a profession that I have mentioned, and see how it fares. In this brief analysis, I shall draw substantially on the recently published book, Schoolteacher, by Dan Lortie, a Canadian who is a sociologist and Professor of Education at the University of Chicago.[3]

Teaching

In regard to the characteristics of the job itself, does teaching provide a unique, definite, and essential social service? There can be little doubt that our society views education as essential; this seems true from the facts that attendance at school is compulsory until past the mid-teens in most provinces and that Canada invests a higher proportion of its gross national product in education than does any other developed country. However, the extent to which the service provided by teachers is unique and definite may be subject to some question. It is widely agreed that a considerable amount of education (and teaching) takes place outside of our school classrooms and is provided by individuals, agencies, or media that are not professional teachers. Clearly, some parents believe that they know more about teaching, or could teach their children better, than professionally trained teachers. This is far from a majority view; yet, it exists to a degree that raises questions about just how unique and definite the role played by professionally trained teachers is viewed to be.

Is the service being rendered perceived by the public to be vital -- that is, concerned with matters of life and death? While a hasty response to this question might be in the negative, when teaching is compared with medicine or law, I believe that after a little thought most people would conclude that teaching can have a substantial impact upon the life of a student. Howsam stated it well in his address to our Jubilee Convocation:

> Because teaching is developmental we often fail to connect it with matters of life and death. For the teacher there is the ever present need to foster life, to encourage the growth and development that is so fundamental to the full life. Life and/or death -- whichever -- come incrementally to children and youth at the hands of society. It is the unique function

> of the teaching profession to ensure that, regardless of what happens to them elsewhere, children bit by bit grow to the best of which they are capable. . . .The alternative in poor schools or with ineffective teachers may be to decrementally suffer the loss of their confidence and self-image and never realize the potential which is theirs.
>
> This is what the teaching profession is all about. It is a matter of life and death.[4]

Many would agree, even though the reference may not be strictly to physical life and death, that the service rendered through teaching is a vital one.

Is there an emphasis upon intellectual techniques in performing the service? The answer to this question is somewhat paradoxical because, while teaching is concerned to a large extent with the intellectual development of students, I do not believe that its performance relies heavily upon intellectual techniques. There are, of course, significant exceptions. But we have not yet succeeded in developing an intellectual framework, science, body of knowledge, or set of generally accepted empirical theories which, when applied in the act of teaching, guarantee success (that is, learning on the part of pupils). Harry Broudy has noted: ". . .As matters now stand, the applicational theory is scant and not very significant."[5] He goes on to state that "we are tempted to rely on the love of children to take the place of expertise."[6] This is not, of course, the fault of teachers. Rather, it is due to scholars of education who have tended to focus most of their research efforts on the study of learning rather than on building a body of knowledge about the nature of teaching. Thus, teaching probably relies at least as much upon emotional sensitivity and dramatic art as it does upon intellectual techniques.

Is teaching accorded a high level of social acceptance and prestige? There is no doubt that teaching falls in the upper half of occupations on

a status scale; it is undoubtedly a socially accepted form of work. However, we cannot in honesty claim that it has yet achieved a high level of social prestige, at least as compared with the more traditional professions.

Does teaching involve a broad range of autonomy, within which its practitioners can specify their own work, control their working conditions, and select their clients? Certainly, teachers prize autonomy; the typically closed classroom door is a symbol of that. However, the range within which this autonomy can operate is severely restricted. As Lortie notes: "Teachers have not gained the legal right to govern their daily work affairs; they do not possess the explicit rights, for example, gained by professors, physicians in hospitals, and clergymen in the armed services. . . .Although teachers have managed to dull the edges of administrative power, they continue to be employed subordinates."[7] Moreover, he goes on to point out that the clients of teachers exercise no choice about subscribing to the service; they are required to attend school throughout most of their childhood and youth, and have practically no say about who will teach them. Similarly, "teachers choose the school district in which they will work but are then assigned by administrators to a particular school and to particular classes within it. Teachers have no formal right to select their clients."[8] Paradoxically, as the perceived importance of teaching as a social service has grown (one measure of professionalism) this has led to greater public interest (and therefore control by non-professionals) and to wider participation (and therefore bureacratization of educational systems), both of which characteristics have resulted in a <u>decrease</u> in the individual teacher's autonomy (another aspect of professionalism).

Teachers

Turning to the characteristics of the individual professional, does the teacher possess a high level of acknowledged and shared expertise, including a body of knowledge and skill and a language on which there is general consensus, that is monopolized by teachers and perceived by the public to be esoteric, or even mystical? I'm afraid not. As I noted earlier, the expertise applied in teaching tends to be at least as much in the affective domain as at the highly cognitive level; to the extent that a unique language of teaching exists, it is found more in the verbiage of professors' publications than in the daily usage of practising teachers; and few members of the public (particularly parents) view the expertise required for teaching as in any way arcane. We lack a body of authoritative and shared expertise and a common technical vocabulary among educationists. We do not have many commonly held, empirically derived, and rigorously grounded practices and principles of pedagogy. Thus, teachers find themselves left pretty much to their own devices when particular instructional situations arise in the classroom. Each teacher tends to develop his own "bag of tricks" on the basis of personal trial and error. As Lortie notes, "teachers say that their principal teacher has been experience; . . . they portray the process as the acquisition of personally tested practices, not as the refinement and application of generally valid principles of instruction."[9]

Do teachers possess a high level of formal education, gained over a long period of specialized training involving selective entry and shared ordeal? Here again, the answer must be in the negative, at least in relation to the more commonly acknowledged professions. Howsam stated it this way in his address to our Jubilee Convocation:

> Professions develop a body of knowledge and a repertoire of behaviors and skills which are passed to the inductees during a protracted period of preparation and used thereafter in the practice of the profession. Neither studies of teaching, reports from teachers themselves, nor examination of preparation programs in colleges and universities reveal the presence of a professional culture for the teaching profession. . . . Teachers believe that they learn little from teacher education. They report that what they know and use as teachers comes largely from childhood teacher models and from personal experience in the classroom during their years of teaching. They learn from teaching rather than about it.[10]

As compared with practitioners of the more traditional professions, the typical teacher has experienced a relatively short period of specialized professional training (only about two academic years' worth at most), his training program has been relatively easy to gain entry into, and the level of difficulty of his professional education has not been so high as to constitute a "shared ordeal" in which he relies heavily upon the moral and social support of his fellow students for emotional survival, as is often the case in medical and legal studies. As a result, there is not a strong and common occupational sub-culture among either student teachers or practising teachers. Lortie states it well when he says:

> Special schooling for teachers is neither intellectually nor organizationally as complex as that found in the established professions. The study of medicine and engineering is rooted in science; law and divinity can point to generations of scholars who have contributed to their development. Neither holds for education, for specialized study of the subject has a short history and an erratic connection with the main stream of intellectual development in modern society. Early study of education was isolated from scholarship; attempts to integrate it with disciplines like psychology have lasted only a few decades. Nor do we find an equivalent to the centuries of codified experience encountered in law, engineering, medicine, divinity, architecture, and accountancy; no way has been found to record and crystallize teaching for the benefit of beginners.[11]

Moreover, we don't find in teaching a long and arduous induction experience such as the internship or residency in medicine and the period of articling

that the budding lawyer must undergo. Rather, the beginning teacher is "thrown into" the same kind of classroom situation in which the experienced teacher works; and he is left largely on his own to "sink or swim." The relatively short periods of practice teaching during the training program do not prepare one for teaching in the way that residency and articling do for medicine and law. There are no arduous "rites of passage" into the teaching occupation as there are in the classical professions. Nor is there the same opportunity to learn on the job at the feet of a "master teacher," because teaching is a uniquely individual craft.

Does the teacher view his profession as his life work, a view characterized by the willingness to defer gratification, a total commitment to the job, and a career orientation characterized by the pursuit of professional development and efforts to contribute to the body of professional knowledge? Lortie's data, collected directly from teachers, would suggest not -- at least as compared with those engaged in the more traditional professions. He notes that a career in teaching does not consist of major steps up a recognized ladder of achievement (unless one virtually leaves the profession in order to become a school administrator); as a result, there is little sense of striving mightily to meet obstacles in the present in order to reap the future benefits of professional goal achievement.[12] Moreover, Lortie found that relatively few teachers enter the occupation with the aim of committing their working lives to it: "Most women expect their careers to be interrupted," and "most men reject teaching as an ultimate goal; they see teaching as a means toward another end -- as an interim engagement."[13] And many teachers, particularly men, have "either a strong avocational interest outside teaching or an additional source of employment income."[14]

Furthermore, there appears to be little involvement among teachers in subjecting their practice to the sustained, empirical, and practice-oriented inquiry into problems and alternatives which one finds among many practitioners in the classical professions. Lortie puts it this way:

> A teacher today can be considered outstanding by those who are familiar with his work without being thought to have made a single contribution to knowledge of teaching in general; the ablest people in the occupation are not expected to add to the shared knowledge of the group. There is, in short, no tradition honoring contributions to the craft.[15]

He further observes that:

> Research in education -- until very recently a small-scale affair -- has concentrated on learning rather than on teaching and has generally employed models and techniques at some distance from the realities of the classroom. . . . The result is that to an astonishing degree the beginner in teaching must start afresh, largely uninformed about prior solutions and alternative approaches to recurring practical problems.[16]

It is, in essence, quite possible for people with limited professional commitment to be teachers.

Does the teacher accept broad personal responsibility for judgements made and acts performed within the scope of professional autonomy? The answer to this, again, is largely negative for two main reasons. First, the autonomy of the individual teacher is heavily constrained by the bureaucracy within which he operates. As Broudy says: "School operation is so rule-ridden that the teacher's autonomy is restricted to trivialities. About all she can do on her own is make minor adaptations in the curriculum material, in the program of study, and in her own style of teaching. Major changes would almost certainly breed suspicion and brew trouble."[17] Secondly, teachers' judgements can be easily questioned. Lortie observes that:

> Although it would require separate research to find out how willing members of the public are to trust teachers' judgements about individual students, that trust rarely matches that extended to qualified therapists. Teachers are certified to teach in schools without demonstrating expert knowledge of individual psychology. There is evidence, moreover, that parents question teachers' judgements and do not feel constrained to "wait it out"; one hears of administrators overruling teachers' judgements.[18]

Is the teacher characterized by a service-orientation, an altruism, an emphasis on the service to be rendered rather than on the income or status to be gained? To this question, the answer is generally affirmative. As Gilbert Highet has noted, "more than the lawyers and the doctors, teachers are selfless people, giving out of themselves far more than they ever expect to get back."[19] And Lortie found in his studies that the vast majority of teachers consider psychic rewards to be their major source of work satisfaction; they are "turned on" by the "joys of teaching."[20]

Teachers' Federations

Let us turn now, briefly, to the characteristics of the colleague group in a profession. Do teachers' organizations publicly espouse a service orientation? The answer to this is mixed. I perceive that, in relating to its own members, a teachers' federation places considerable emphasis upon service and professional matters such as continuing education opportunities. In particular, I have found the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation to be more professionally oriented than its counterparts in any other jurisdictions where I've worked. Yet, because of the nature and visibility of collective bargaining (particularly recently in this province because of the work on the new Education Act), I suspect that the general public sees much more of the "labour union" aspect of a teachers' federation's work than of its service orientation.

Does the colleague group have a recognized code of ethics, clarified and interpreted over the years by concrete cases, and maintained by sanctions imposed by the group on its members? There are certainly some ethics espoused by teachers' federations, and considerable informal pressure can be brought to bear on individuals who breach them. However, the teachers' federation has few sanctions available for it to exercise, and as a result it does not play as strong a role in this domain as do colleges of physicians or law societies, for example.

Does the colleague group comprise a comprehensive, self-governing organization of practitioners? There can be little doubt about this. The teachers' federation is very comprehensive (including not only practising teachers but many non-teaching educators as well) and as an organization it governs its own affairs through a regionally representative council, a slate of executive officers, and a large and competently staffed secretariat.

Does the colleague group control training and entry into the profession? The answer to this is "no" on both counts. Although representatives of the teachers' federation serve in an advisory capacity in regard to both teacher education and teacher certification, the former is controlled by universities and the latter by the provincial Department of Education.

Does the colleague group monitor the performance and control the behaviour of individual members? Teachers' federations have not won the degree of autonomy that characterizes other professions. They tend not to exercise discipline over their members, on the assumption that this is the responsibility of "management." The right to hire and fire teachers rests primarily with local boards of education, made up of laymen who are, almost by definition, not members of the colleague group. The

responsibility for determining the specific assignments of teachers rests with administrators who, while often holding membership in the colleague group, are no longer practitioners of the craft. And much of what a teacher can and cannot do is determined by provincial authority, exercised again largely by officials who are not members of the colleague group.

In conclusion, teaching possesses several of the characteristics of a profession. But it also falls short on a number of them, particularly those involving autonomy and self-control on the part of practitioners, depth of commitment and career-orientation, and the accordance of trust, status, and authority by the general public.

How Can Teaching Become More Professional?

What steps might be taken to move the occupation of teaching toward a higher level of professionalization? I believe that there are at least three contexts within which something might be done toward this end -- two of them in "the field" and one at the university.

In Practice

At the level of the individual practitioner, teachers could strive for a higher degree of commitment to their profession through improving their own capabilities by the aggressive pursuit of professional development opportunities and through adding to the knowledge base of the profession by conducting applied research in the context of their own classroom activities. Lortie's study, however, suggests that there are elements in the "ethos" of teaching that run counter to the direction of professionalization. The major elements he identified after interviewing hundreds of teachers are conservatism (as opposed to dynamism or change-orientation), individualism (which tends to discourage arrangements for colleagial

judgement), and presentism (which runs counter to the future-orientation required for contributions to the incremental development of a body of practical knowledge about teaching by teachers). Thus, he concludes that "unless teachers substitute professionally oriented values for those they currently express, they will be hard pressed to claim professional status in a centralized system of public education."[21]

A second context in which professionalization could be pursued is that of the colleague group, or teachers' federation. It is in this domain that control of teaching by teachers may be gained, and the provincial teachers' federations in Canada are aware of this and are aggressively pursuing it. In the pursuit, however, they have typically chosen (perhaps with no viable alternative) the adversary model of labour union negotiations. This leads to a rather tragic irony in that the harder a federation strives for professional autonomy on the part of its members, the more it is perceived by those with authority to grant autonomy as behaving in a non-professional way. I suspect that new strategies will have to be developed by teachers' federations before they are successful in winning any substantial gains in the professional autonomy enjoyed by their members.

On Campus

The third context within which the professionalization of teaching may be forwarded is the one with which I am most familiar -- the university. At this point, let me mention a few of the developments we have initiated at our College of Education which, in my opinion, can contribute to the increased professionalization of teaching.

With respect to the nature of teacher education, we are now requiring a minimum period of three years' training as opposed to the previous two, and I suspect that in practice most of our students will remain with us for the full four-year degree program. It is also likely

that those pursuing teacher education following completion of a first degree in another college will soon be required to complete the B.Ed. before qualifying for a Professional A Certificate in Saskatchewan. The induction process will be upgraded through the inclusion of the extended practicum (a full sixteen-week "internship") as a requirement for all of our students. I hope that we can incorporate into this extended practicum some variety of exposure to different cooperating teachers, pupils, schools, and communities, thereby enhancing the richness of the pre-service practical experience. We are taking steps to increase the intellectual quality of our course content by eliminating "mickey mouse" offerings, combining related classes into stronger single offerings, improving the integration among different but related disciplines within the field of Education, increasing the requirements for an academic major from four to at least five classes, and upgrading our own performance as professors through implementing a rigorous new promotions and tenure policy that our faculty approved in 1977. And we are striving to enhance the articulation between theory and practice in our programs so that our graduates will be in a better position to test and refine the body of knowledge and to become skilful in on-the-job improvement of the "technology" of teaching; as one strategy for pursuing this objective, we hope that with some groups of students we can offer our classes in school settings rather than restricting them to the sometimes sterile milieu of the university campus.

Turning to the attitudinal aspects of professionalization, we hope to build a greater degree of professional commitment, of esprit de corps, and even of a sense of shared ordeal among our students, particularly through an organizational arrangement whereby we shall group many of our students into relatively small cohorts, each of which will

work closely with an interdepartmental team of faculty members; this approach should not only improve the interdisciplinary integration of the professional program, but it should also facilitate greater personalization and focus in teacher training, both of which we hope will lead to a deeper sense of identity with the program activities and career goals the group is pursuing in common and to a higher spirit of professional camaraderie among the students in the group and between them and the professorial team with which they are working. Further, we are already noticing substantial attitudinal shifts as a result of the admission limits we have imposed in the College and the more rigorous selection criteria we are developing; the tendencies to view teaching as something that anyone can do and to view the College of Education as a place that anyone can get into are rapidly disappearing. We have also significantly raised the performance standards for progression from year to year in our programs and for graduation from them; this is not only increasing the rigor of the training experience, but it is also contributing to more respectful attitudes toward the profession of teaching and the means of qualifying to practise it.

Finally, in regard to the contribution of practitioners to preparation for their profession, we have taken a number of steps to increase teacher involvement in teacher education. Practising teachers have been added to the major program committees which determine the nature of teacher education on our campus, they have been appointed to small subject-matter committees that we have established in cooperation with the College of Arts and Science in order to improve the nature and relevance of classes offered by that College for prospective teachers, and they have been included in the membership of our recently established College committees on admissions and on field services. In addition, we are

working closely with cooperating teachers to expand the degree of authority and responsibility they assume as contributors to the professional training of student teachers assigned to them. A number of practising teachers serve as instructors in our classes, and we hope to initiate several year-long exchanges between members of our faculty and professional practitioners in school systems and other education agencies within the Saskatoon region. Moreover, we are striving to increase our contribution to the body of knowledge about teaching through placing greater emphasis upon research in the College, and to facilitate the professional development of practising teachers by paying more attention to our graduate studies programs, by better coordinating and more directly focussing our in-service offerings and consultation services, and by improving the access of practising teachers to major professional resources in our College such as the Education Library, the Curriculum Studies laboratories in various subject areas, and the members of our faculty.

In various ways, then, I believe we are taking some steps at the College of Education which will increase the professionalization of teaching. Nevertheless, for reasons I mentioned above, I doubt that teachers will ever become professionals in the full sociological sense, as doctors and lawyers are generally recognized to be.

Conclusion

Let me conclude, however, by emphasizing that I do not think that teachers <u>should</u> aspire to professionalism in the classical sense. I believe that teaching can be a highly prized and unique occupation; but to achieve this it must develop its own occupational identity and integrity, rather than "aping" those of other groups in the work force. Howsam expressed this view very well in his address to our Jubilee Convocation:

> . . . becoming gradually clear is the realization that the model of the traditional professions may not be sufficient for us. We may indeed need to march to a different drummer.[22]

Teaching can be an important, demanding, and rewarding occupation -- perhaps much more so than the classical professions. It should be enjoyed and developed to its fullest potential -- idiosyncratically, rather than longing after the characteristics and designations of other occupations which teaching cannot, and should not, try to imitate.

In other words, prospective and practising teachers should be urged to take joy and pride in being teachers, and in the improvement of teaching for its <u>own</u> sake -- and for the sake of their students.

References

[1]Robert B. Howsam, "The Trails that Ships Make in the Water" (unpublished paper presented at the Jubilee Convocation of the University of Saskatchewan College of Education, Saskatoon, 1977), p. 4.

[2]See, for example, Myron Lieberman, Education as a Profession (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1956).

[3]Dan C. Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975).

[4]Howsam, op. cit., p. 10.

[5]Harry S. Broudy, The Real World of the Public Schools (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972), p. 57.

[6]Ibid., p. 245.

[7]Lortie, op. cit., p. 22.

[8]Ibid., p. 137.

[9]Ibid., pp. 79-80.

[10]Howsam, op. cit., p. 4.

[11]Lortie, op. cit., p. 58.

[12]Ibid., pp. 84-5.

[13]Ibid., p. 86.

[14]Ibid., p. 95.

[15]Ibid., p. 241.

[16]Ibid., p. 70

[17]Broudy, op. cit., pp. 42-3.

[18]Lortie, op. cit., p. 167.

[19]Gilbert Highet, The Immortal Profession: The Joys of Teaching and Learning (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1976), p. 56.

[20]Lortie, op. cit., p. 104.

[21]Ibid., p. 228.

[22]Howsam, op. cit., p. 8.